

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 23-27 have been canceled, and claims 18, 28, and 29 have been amended. Claim 30 has been newly added. Support for the subject matter of the amended claims is provided for example in cancelled claims 23-27 and the original claims. (It should be noted that references herein to the specification and drawings are for illustrative purposes only and are not intended to limit the scope of the invention to the referenced embodiments.)

Claims 18, 19, and 22-29 were rejected, under 35 USC §102(e), as being anticipated by Benveniste (US 7,095,754). Claims 20 and 21 were rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Benveniste. To the extent these rejections may be deemed applicable to the amended and new claims presented herein, the Applicants respectfully traverse based on the point set forth below.

Claim 18 recites features of canceled claims 24, 26, and 27 and now defines a wireless communication method in which a receiving station receives an indication of whether or not a response is expected, or whether or not there is an intent to continue, and alters its interpretations of idle time slots depending on the received indication. The claimed subject matter advantageously provides an ability to reduce medium access overhead and improve medium utilization efficiency and throughput (see specification page 15, lines 1-5).

Benveniste discloses, in Fig. 7B, three idle time slots: (1) a TCMA access point contention period 735, (2) a contention-free period 716, and (3) a tiered contention multiple access period 718. However, Benveniste does not disclose or suggest a receiving station that

alters the interpretations of these three idle time slots depending on whether or not a response is expected or there is an intent to continue.

The differences between the Applicants' claimed subject matter and Benveniste may be better understood by considering the basis in the Office Action for rejecting claims 24 and 26, whose relevant subject matter is now incorporated into claim 18. Claim 24 recited interpreting idle time slots a first way when a signal indicating no expected response or intent to continue is received, and claim 26 recited interpreting the idle time slots a different way when a signal indicating an expected response or intent to continue is received. Thus, claims 24 and 26 recited interpreting idle time slots differently for mutually exclusive conditions. (It is noted that the previous claims referred to receipt of a "signal" whereas the amended claims more broadly refer to receipt of an indication.)

However, the Office Action cited an identical basis and findings of fact for rejecting each of claims 24 and 26. More specifically, the Office Action stated, with respect to each of claims 24 and 26, that Benveniste discloses the Applicants' claimed condition of no expected response (see Office Action page 5, line 20, and page 8, lines 2-3). However, Benveniste's alleged disclosure of a signal indicating no expected response is not identical to the present claimed subject matter, previously recited in claim 26 and now recited in claim 18, of receipt of an indication of an expected response.

As a result, Benveniste does not disclose the subject matter now recited in present claim 18 of a receiving station that receives a signal indicating whether or not a response is expected or there is an intent to continue and alters its interpretations of idle time slots depending on the received indication.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that Benveniste does not anticipate the subject matter now defined by claim 18. Therefore, the rejections applied to claims 20 and 21 are deemed to be obviated, and allowance of claim 18 and all claims dependent therefrom is considered to be warranted.

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

If any issues remain which may best be resolved through a telephone communication, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at the local Washington, D.C. telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/James Edward Ledbetter/

Date: May 27, 2009
JEL/DWW/att

James E. Ledbetter
Registration No. 28,732

Attorney Docket No. 009289-06170
Dickinson Wright PLLC
1875 Eye Street, NW, Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 659-6966
Facsimile: (202) 659-1559